



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,563	08/28/2006	Karsten Bohnisch	SEA4486P00030US	7311
32116 7590 03/03/2010 WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER NICHOLS IL ROBERT K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3754				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/03/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/566,563

**Applicant(s)**

BOHNISCH ET AL.

**Examiner**

ROBERT K. NICHOLS II

**Art Unit**

3754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/225)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/21/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/21/2009 . As directed by the amendment: claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 have been amended, claims 5, 6 and 8 have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-4, 7 and 9 are presently pending in this application.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 recites "activation- and dispensing head" in line 17.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the phrase "can be" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the free-flowing medium" in line 21. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 1-2, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia (EP 1 050 481) and Stone (US 4,322,020) in view of Meshberg (US 4,008,830).**

Regarding claims 1-2 and 9, Garcia discloses a dispenser pack including a metering pump 14, a container 24 having a neck 32, a closing cap 130, a cylindrical wall 190 that encloses an axial aperture 192 that is arranged above an internal flange 196; a retainer 140 for attaching the pump 14 within the aperture 192 of the closing cap 130, wherein an exterior flange of the retainer 140 can be pressed against an annular seal 132 on an outer face of the container neck 32 so as to be sealed by the closing cap 130; a pump housing including a pump cylinder 141 that surrounds a pump chamber whose upper end includes an aperture and whose lower end includes a suction pipe nipple freely exposed (see figures 2 and 3); and a piston shaft 148 which protrudes outward from the pump chamber and at its outer end includes an activation head 16

(see figure 2). Garcia further discloses that the volume of the container 24 that contains the free-flowing medium can be adjusted to the decrease of the volume of the free-flowing medium to be dispensed from the container 24; and an inner hole rim of the seal 132 forms an annular lip resting against the outside of the pump housing 141 so as to be airtight (see figures 1 and 3).

With further respect to claim 1, Garcia discloses all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent to the teaching of the inner structure of the pump and the medium being enclosed by a bag made of flexible material.

Stone teaches a dispenser pack including a metering pump 3, including a pump housing having a pump cylinder that surrounds a pump chamber 30 (see fig. 3); a pump piston arranged in the pump chamber 30 so as to be slidable in a sealed manner (fig. 3), and includes a piston shaft 18 which protrudes outward from the pump chamber 30 and at its outer end includes an activation head 16; an axial outlet channel that extends through the piston shaft 18 and the pump piston and connects the pump chamber 30 to a dispensing aperture of the activation head 16 (fig. 3); an inlet valve 21 and an outlet valve 19 for the free-flowing medium; and a helical compression spring 23 which impinges on the pump piston in the direction of its home position (see figure 3 and column 5, lines 21-30). Stone further discloses the container having an interior with variable volume wherein the container medium is enclosed by a bag made of flexible material allowing the bag's volume to reduce as product is pumped out the container.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the pump of Garcia to include inner structure, as taught by Stone, in order to extract fluid product from the container.

Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill has good reasons to pursue the known options or finite number of solutions, i.e. a container including a flexible bag, as suggested by Stone, or a container including a follower piston, for the predictable result of providing a container whose interior volume reduces in conjunction with the dispensing of the product, since the finite number of options are within the technical grasp of a person of ordinary skill in the art.

The combination of Garcia and Stone discloses all the elements of the claimed invention except the bag having an upper aperture rim forming a one piece construction with a wall of the container.

Meshberg teaches a dispenser pack wherein the medium within the container is enclosed by a bag made of a flexible material (figs 1, 3 and 4), wherein the bag has an upper aperture rim forming a one piece construction with a wall of the container to avoid the necessity of inserting a flexible bag upon assembly (see figure 4 and column 5, lines 10-15).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the device of the combination of Garcia and Stone with a bag having an upper aperture rim forming a one piece construction with a wall of the container, as taught by Meshberg, in order to avoid the necessity of inserting a flexible bag upon assembly.

Regarding claim 7, the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

**Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia (EP 1 050 481), Stone (US 4,322,020) and Meshberg (US 4,008,830) as applied to claims 1-2, 7 and 9 above, further in view of Nomoto et al. (US 6,266,943).**

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the combination of Garcia, Stone and Meshberg disclose all the elements of the claimed invention except the seal being in the form of a truncated cone, wherein the thickness is reduced towards the outer end of the annular lip.

Nomoto teaches a dispenser pack including an annular seal (F) on an outer face of the container neck 405, wherein the thickness of the seal is reduced towards the outer end of an annular lip 435a (fig 36). Nomoto discloses the seal (F) pressed radially inward in the form of a truncated cone across an annular space against the cylindrical outside of the pump housing in order to provide tight seal, capable of releasing compressed air, when the inner pressure of the container (D) rises after pump installation (see figures 36, 37 and column 31, lines 34-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the device of the combination of Garcia, Stone and Meshberg with a seal being in the form of a truncated cone, wherein the thickness is reduced towards

the outer end of the annular lip, as taught by Nomoto, in order to provide tight seal, capable of releasing compressed air, when the inner pressure of the container rises after pump installation.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments submitted under "Remarks" in the response filed on 10/21/2009 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new rejections made in this action.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bougamount et al. (US 6,415,962), Brule (US 6,360,919), Moore et al. (US 6,974,055) and Andre (US 5,092,495) show other devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT K. NICHOLS II whose telephone number is (571)270-5312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. K. N./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 3754